

10.0 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

10.1 OVERVIEW

Early coordination with the general public and appropriate public agencies is encouraged in the environmental review process in order to determine the scope of the environmental document, the level of analysis, and related environmental requirements. Agency consultation and public participation for the SR-22/West Orange County Connection have been accomplished through a variety of formal and informal methods, including project development team meetings, Steering Committee meetings, Elected Officials briefings, interagency coordination, public outreach program including print media and newsletters, open houses, and planned public hearings following the circulation of this document.

In Fall 1997, OCTA launched a two-year Major Investment Study (MIS) and Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement to determine how best to improve travel along SR-22 between SR-55 and the I-405 and I-605 interchange. The purpose of the Major Investment Study (MIS) is to evaluate alternatives for their ability to solve the transportation problems of the study area. In July 1997 the MIS for the project was initiated and a Steering Committee was formed to guide the development of the MIS. The MIS followed a three-part process prescribed by federal requirements and included development of study goals, establishment of project alternatives to meet those goals, and creation of evaluation criteria to allow comparison of the proposed alternatives.

The MIS process for this study area consists of five major goals: defining the transportation need, identifying a range of reasonable and feasible alternatives to meet that need, conducting a screening-level alternatives evaluation to determine the alternatives to be studied further in the project development and environmental documentation phases of the study, analyzing the impacts of the alternatives in a Draft Environmental Document, and documenting public and agency comments and responses in a Final Environmental Document. These project study goals were adopted by the Steering Committee on November 17, 1997 and by OCTA Board on January 26, 1998.

The MIS process was initiated through development of several pieces of base information, which were then presented to the public through community workshops. Public input was gathered on the basic problems in the study area and public perception was assessed on the need for improvements. The next stage in the development of the MIS was the screening of alternatives against the evaluation criteria. The results of the analysis were included in the Final MIS Evaluation Report, which was submitted to OCTA and presented to the Peer Review Group, Steering Committee, and public. With the completion of the MIS Evaluation Report, the study process began with implementation of the Project Study Report and the DEIR/EIS. After the DEIR/EIS has been publicly circulated and a Public Hearing has been held, the FEIR/EIS will be prepared.

This MIS Evaluation Report does not recommend alternatives for further engineering and environmental compliance, but rather presents the evaluation process and technical analysis results to the public and the SR-22/West Orange County Connection Steering Committee. It is also intended to facilitate informed input to the Orange County Transportation Authority (OCTA) Board, who ultimately adopted alternatives for further engineering and environmental compliance including the No Build Alternative, the TSM/Expanded Bus Service Alternative, and the build alternatives.

10.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH PUBLIC AGENCIES

The SR-22/West Orange County Connection is subject to both NEPA and CEQA. Caltrans is the lead agency for the CEQA document (EIR) and FHWA is the lead agency for the NEPA document (EIS). OCTA is a responsible agency under CEQA.

10.2.1 Agencies Contacted

More than 215 federal, state, and local agencies and officials were contacted to inform them of study initiation and to solicit comments. Agencies directly involved in the study include the following:

- FHWA
- U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) FTA/FHWA – Metro-LA
- Caltrans District 12, Santa Ana
- CHP, Westminster
- OCTA
- SCAG
- SCAQMD
- County of Orange
- City of Cypress
- City of Garden Grove
- City of Los Alamitos
- City of Orange
- City of Santa Ana
- City of Seal Beach
- City of Stanton
- City of Westminster
- Leisure World (City of Seal Beach)

10.2.2 Project Development Team

Project Development Team (PDT) meetings, consisting of Caltrans District 12, OCTA, and FHWA have been conducted periodically throughout the MIS/EIR/EIS process. In addition to these PDT meetings, OCTA has held regular Project Management Team (PMT) meetings to discuss project development issues. Besides these general meetings, numerous special-purpose meetings and coordination occurs between individual team members to discuss specific issues.

10.2.3 Steering Committee

In July 1997, OCTA formed a Steering Committee consisting of agency representatives for affected local, state, and federal agencies to help guide development of the study process. Steering Committee meetings were conducted on October 1, 1997; November 19, 1997; January 15, 1998; May 28, 1998; and July 14, 1998. See Appendix A in Volume II of the DEIR/EIS for the meeting agendas. Table 10.2-1 lists the members of the Steering Committee.

10.2.4 Elected Officials Coordination

As part of the Public Involvement Program two Elected Officials Breakfasts were conducted. The first breakfast meeting was held in December 1997 and the second was held in June 1998 at the Garden Grove Community Center. OCTA and Caltrans staff met with city officials from the six impacted cities within the study area, which included Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Westminster, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, and Orange. At the first meeting, OCTA and Caltrans staff presented the proposed alternatives, provided an outline of the study process, and gathered initial input on specific city issues and concerns. At the second meeting, the draft evaluation report and technical analysis of proposed alternatives were presented and city comments were solicited.

10.2.5 Consultation with Resource Agencies

A. U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

As part of their coordination and consultation efforts, in June 2000 Caltrans contacted USFWS requesting information on sensitive/listed species that potentially occur within the limits of the SR-22/West Orange County Connection study area. The March 16, 2001 response letter from USFWS is provided in Appendix B of the Natural Environment Study.

B. CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

As part of their coordination and consultation efforts, Caltrans contacted CDFG in June 2000, requesting information on sensitive/listed species that potentially occur within the SR-22/West Orange County Connection study area. The letter sent to CDFG, and their response are provided in Appendix B of the Natural Environment Study.

C. U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Caltrans, OCTA, and the SR-22/West Orange County Connection consultants have informally consulted with the Corps regarding permitting for the various project elements. Specifically, a draft NEPA/Section 404 Permit Process Determination Preliminary Information Package was prepared. Caltrans used this and supplemental information in discussions with the Corps and received a preliminary determination that the project would be consistent with existing nationwide Section 404 permits (Vega, 1999). The Section 404 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) process was not applied because of the anticipated applicability of a nationwide 404 permit. The July 26, 2000 Corps letter stating their determination is provided in Appendix B of the Natural Environment Study.

**Table 10.2-1
STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Member	Agency	Member	Agency
Jeremy Farfan	Assembly District 71 Representative	Larry L. Rhinehart	Director of Intergovernmental Affairs
Ken Maddox	Assemblyman 68 th District	Bob Cady	FHWA
Don Gilchrist	Senatorial Representative	Dick Stillwell	Long Beach Transit
Loretta Donovan	Senatorial Representative	Roy Choi	Long Beach Transit
Chris Leo	State Assembly Representative	Eck Chaiboonma	MTA
Michele Morrissey	State Assembly Representative	Maureen Micheline	MTA
Adnan Maiah	Caltrans District 12	Cptn. Tom McCarthy	OCTA
Barbara Gossett/ Chris Flynn	Caltrans District 12	Jim Harmon	OCTA
Dale Ratzlaff	Caltrans District 12	Lt. Jay Leflore	OCTA
Gale Farber	Caltrans District 12	Randy Vannoy	OCTA
Javier Galindo	Caltrans District 12	Dana Wiemiller	OCTA
Jim Beil	Caltrans District 12	Dave Elbaum	OCTA
Judith Heyer	Caltrans District 12	Ellen Burton	OCTA
Ken Nelson	Caltrans District 12	Jose Solorio	OCTA
Leslie Manderscheid	Caltrans District 12	Kia Mortazavi	OCTA
Hamid Toossi	Caltrans District 7	Paul Lanning	OCTA
Sgt. Jay Gentile	CHP, Santa Ana	Rick Grebner	OCTA

Table 10.2-1 (continued)

STEERING COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Lt. Les Davis	CHP, Westminster	Ron Taira	OCTA
Sgt. Sherrell Sutherland	CHP, Westminster	Don Capelle	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Keith Carter	City of Cypress	Donna McCormick	Parsons Brinckerhoff
George Allen	City of Garden Grove	Steven Yoshizumi	Parsons Brinckerhoff
Jim Smith	City of Garden Grove	Amir Ilkhanipour	Public Facilities and Resources Department
Ed Shikada	City of Long Beach	Kenny Dang	Public Facilities and Resources Department
Mike Kim	City of Los Alamitos	Lance Natsuhara	Public Facilities and Resources Department
Hamid Bahadori	City of Orange	Russ Lightcap	Rossmoor Community Services
George Alvarez	City of Santa Ana	Eyvonne Sells	SCAQMD
Joyce Amerson	City of Santa Ana	Lupe Valdez	SCAQMD
Steve Badum	City of Seal Beach	Von Loveland	SCAQMD
Mike Kim	City of Stanton	Debra Redman	SCAQMD
Marwan Youssef	City of Westminster	Sandra Balmir	FTA/FHWA Metro-LA
Peter Mackprang	City of Westminster		
Ken Smith	County of Orange		

D. STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

Caltrans has provided the Historic Property Survey Report, Historic Architectural Survey Report, and the Negative Archaeological Survey Report to FHWA for transmittal to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). The Negative Archaeological Survey Report and the Historic Architectural Survey Report are provided in Appendix A and Appendix B of the Historic Property Survey Report, respectively. SHPO's conclusion on the HPSR and Determination of Effect Finding of Adverse Effect (DOE/FOE) documentation are as follows:

- SHPO concurs with FHWA's determination that the Full Build Alternative, with its proposed Pacific Electrical Arterial component, will have an adverse effect on the Pacific Electric/Santa Ana Bridge if selected as the preferred alternative;
- SHPO concurs that the Reduced Build Alternative, if selected as the preferred alternative, will have no effect on historic properties.

In the event the Full Build Alternative is selected as the preferred alternative, FHWA will develop a draft Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for review by SHPO in order to address the proposed project's effects on historic properties.

The SHPO letter to FHWA regarding their finding is attached as Appendix E in Volume II of the DEIR/EIS.

10.3 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

The Public Involvement Program (PIP) was designed to assess public opinion and solicit input in two phases, the Brainstorming and the Scoping. The Brainstorming Phase was implemented to preview issues and define alternatives for study and evaluation. The Scoping Phase focused on improvement alternatives and effects and results of each alternative.

10.3.1 Notification List

OCTA implemented an aggressive notification process to inform the potentially impacted communities of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Westminster, Garden Grove, Santa Ana, Orange, and unincorporated areas of Orange County along the SR-22 about the project study. A base list of individuals and organizations presumed to have a significant interest in the study was assembled to serve as the basic mailing list for the initial public workshops conducted in December 1997. This list was created in cooperation with each of the cities located contiguous to the project site. Staff representing each city were contacted by OCTA and asked to submit lists of key community groups, civic organizations, elected and appointed officials, churches, neighborhood associations, social service groups, businesses and employers, public hearing notice or city council agenda recipients and any other interested parties. These base lists were supplemented by several thousand names drawn from the existing OCTA database. This database includes chambers of commerce; individuals who have attended OCTA-sponsored public meetings; ethnic and minority organizations; social service and paratransit providers; local, state, and federal officials and resource agencies; recipients of the OCTA agendas and newsletters and other publications; schools and educators; major employers; media outlets; etc. This entire OCTA database was analyzed and all addresses located within the zip codes contiguous to the project area were sorted out to create an interested parties universe.

10.3.2 Public Workshops

The Brainstorming Phase of the PIP involved three Public Workshops held in December 1997 at the following locations and times:

- Garden Grove Community Center on Tuesday, December 9, 1997
- OCTA office in Orange on Wednesday, December 10, 1997
- Los Alamitos Community Center on Thursday, December 11, 1997

The workshops were held to gain initial input regarding the proposed alternatives, to preview the issues, and to define the public concern regarding noise due to lack of noise barriers in key areas. They included a brief presentation and a facilitated discussion of the transportation alternatives considered for the study. Participants were asked to complete a survey at the conclusion of the workshop and to include any additional comments. The three Public Workshops yielded a preliminary set of alternatives.

To publicize the study and workshops and to permit people to provide input through the mail, fax, or internet, project materials were distributed to 20,000 households within the project area, notices were sent to public agencies and local governments, multilingual newspaper ads were placed, surveys reaching 160,000 readers were printed, press releases went out, public service announcements were made, and project information and surveys were placed on the OCTA website, as well as articles in OCTA monthly newsletters.

Survey and Discussion Results of 1997 Public Workshops

Of the more than 125 people who attended the workshops, 100 completed surveys. Participants also submitted numerous explanatory comments to the open-ended questions and 11 people returned the newspaper survey.

Survey results from the three workshops showed that residents preferred the addition of general-purpose lanes and supported implementation of HOV connectors in conjunction with HOV lanes. The least preferred alternative was the No Build option. Participants were also asked to select the most important

evaluation criteria. Participants in Garden Grove and Los Alamitos listed right-of-way acquisition most frequently, followed by air quality, and noise. Participants in Orange felt that safety was the top evaluation criteria, followed by air quality, and cost-effectiveness. Preferred communication methods varied between the workshops. The most popular method was direct mail and surveys, followed by public workshops.

During the discussion period, workshop participants had similar concerns and suggested other alternatives as a solution. These alternatives included:

- Signal synchronization on parallel arterial streets
- Installing electric signage on SR-22 to monitor traffic conditions
- Building soundwalls
- Implementing the Smart Street program
- Building a fixed guideway transit line along the former Pacific Electric right-of-way
- Making the former Pacific Electric right-of-way an arterial for HOVs only

Public Opinion Polls

Independent of the SR-22/West Orange County Connection MIS, three professionally conducted quantitative public opinions polls were taken to evaluate the different alternatives:

- Vision 2020 in July 1996
- Rail Study poll in May 1997
- SR-91 HOT Lanes poll in May 1997

These polls were administered to 600 high-propensity registered voters throughout Orange County. In each poll respondents were read a question and then asked to indicate how they felt about the statement. Response choices were: strongly approve, somewhat approve, somewhat disapprove, strongly disapprove, or no opinion.

Poll results show general support for HOV lanes and environmental policies. The polls indicate that Orange County voters place a high priority on improving existing roads as opposed to building new roads and that improvements to the SR-22 are important. There is also support for preserving the former Pacific Electric right-of-way for future transportation uses, but should not be included in this study.

Results of 1998 Open House/Public Scoping Meeting

The public views the study as separate sub-projects with varying levels of importance. The mainline SR-22 is the top priority for improvements with minimal support for any type of improvement along the former Pacific Electric right-of-way. Alternative 4, General-Purpose Lanes, was the first choice among improvement alternatives, followed by HOV alternatives. If HOV lanes are constructed on the mainline, the public strongly supports HOV connectors at major interchanges within the project area. Noise, safety, and right-of-way concerns were also brought up during the meeting.

Top priorities included:

- Reducing congestion during peak commute hours
- Minimizing air quality impacts
- Safety

- Moving people efficiently

Much like the three December 1997 community workshops, survey results indicated minimal support for Alternative 1, No Build, Alternative 2, TSM, and Alternative 3, Fixed Guideway.

10.3.3 NEPA/CEQA Notifications

A. NOTIFICATION OF INITIATION OF STUDIES

The Notification of Initiation of Studies (NOIS) is a letter required by Caltrans that is prepared to inform other agencies that Caltrans, and in this case, OCTA, were formally initiating studies related to a highway project. It briefly describes the proposed project and outlines the documents that will be prepared.

The NOIS for the SR-22/West Orange County Connection was sent out on May 1, 1998, to City Councils, Boards of Supervisors and affected state, federal, regional, and municipal agencies and other interested parties (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS). It superceded a previous NOIS sent in the Fall of 1997 to clarify the alternatives being considered, based on the December 1997 workshops. It also announced a Scoping Meeting for the project.

B. NOTICE OF PREPARATION

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) is a CEQA-required document that is drafted if the lead agency determines that an EIR is required. The NOP and environmental significance checklist is mailed out to federal and trustee agencies responsible for approval, funding and natural resources affected by the project. The NOP must include:

- A description of the project
- Location of the project on an attached map or by street address in an urbanized area
- Possible environmental effects of the project
- Specific reference to and solicitation of agencies' views on potential impacts to historical properties.

The NOP and the checklist must be sent out together by certified mail or any other method, which provides a record that the notice was received. Within 30 days of receiving the NOP, responsible agencies shall provide comments on the scope and content of the document, including possible alternatives and mitigation measures. If, after 30 days, a responsible agency does not respond with comments or a request for additional time, it is concluded that they have no comments (Section 15082, CEQA Handbook, 1994).

A NOP for the SR-22/West Orange County Connection was sent on May 29, 1998 to more than 215 federal, state, and local agencies and officials to inform them of study initiation and to solicit comments (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS).

C. NOTICE OF INTENT

NEPA requires that if a project includes federal involvement, the Notice of Intent (NOI) must be published by the EPA in the *Federal Register*. This letter solicits federal agencies' comments and suggestions for the required EIS.

The NOI for SR-22/West Orange County Connection was published on Wednesday, June 3, 1998 in the *Federal Register*, Volume 63, Number 106, pages 30284 and 30285 (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS).

10.3.4 Scoping Meetings

In the spring of 1998, the Scoping Phase was launched to evaluate the six proposed alternatives and to address noise barrier issues. As part of this phase, one Public Scoping Meeting was held on June 23, 1998 at the Garden Grove Community Center, as well as a separate meeting, held at the same time and in the same location, to address noise barrier issues. To advertise the Scoping Meeting and gain additional input, two direct mail surveys were sent to residents and businesses in the area and a survey requesting input was listed on OCTA's website. Full-page ads ran in the *Community Close-Up* and *Excelsior* on June 18 and 19, 1998. The Scoping Meeting was also announced in the NOIS and NOI.

The format of the Scoping Meeting consisted of a self-paced exhibit with technical staff available to answer questions. A comprehensive survey was distributed at the meeting requesting participants to comment on suggested freeway improvements, alternative proposals, and issues that should be addressed in evaluation of the proposed alternatives. Respondents could add any additional comments they had regarding improvements to mobility of SR-22.

10.3.5 Direct Mail Campaign

In December 1997, upon completion of the mailing list, a direct mail notice went to 10,000 residents within the study area in order to publicize the study and permit people to provide input. In June 1998, a project newsletter was distributed to 18,500 residents and businesses within one-eighth mile of the study area and 5,000 absentee property owners within one-quarter mile of the study area to advertise the Public Scoping Meetings and allow for public input (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS). In addition, project newsletters were distributed to more than 400 residents and officials on the project mailing database in June 1999 and February 2000.

10.3.6 Print Media Campaign

On November 28, and 29, 1997 half page ads ran in the local newspapers, the *Los Alamitos Enterprise*, the *Community Close-Up*, and the *Orange County News*, informing residents and business owners where workshops were taking place (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS). A total of 159,044 readers were reached via newspaper ads. A front-page story also ran in the *Orange County Register*, the *Los Angeles Times* and the *Los Alamitos Enterprise*. In order to reach multi-cultural populations in the affected area, a Spanish language ad ran in the *Excelsior* newspaper and Vietnamese Public Service Announcements were aired on Little Saigon Radio. In June 1998, information regarding the Public Scoping Meetings was delivered through full-page ads in local and Spanish language newspapers, as well as public service announcements on Vietnamese radio.

10.3.7 OCTA Board Meetings

On September 8, 1997, the OCTA Board voted to expand the scope of the SR-22 project to include: I-405 between SR-22 and I-605; I-605 between I-405 and Katella Avenue; and the former Pacific Electric right-of-way between SR-22 and Bristol Street. The name of the project was subsequently changed to SR-22/West Orange County Connection.

On January 26, 1998, OCTA held a Board meeting at the County of Orange Planning Commission Hearing Room, Hall of Administration, 10 Civic Center Plaza. OCTA presented a summary of the public input from the community workshops on the project, including study goals, transportation alternatives, and potential evaluation criteria. The Board concurred with the development of the study up to that date and approved further evaluation of improvements for the study area.

On August 10, 1998, OCTA held a Board meeting at the County of Orange Planning Commission Hearing Room. OCTA Staff requested that the Board authorize them to proceed with the environmental clearance and preliminary engineering of a build alternative. The Board unanimously agreed to proceed with the preparation of the draft environmental document and begin preliminary engineering of two alternatives (Alternative 4B, General-Purpose Lanes, and Alternative 6C, HOV Lanes Full System) from the State Route 22/West County Connection Major Investment Study.

On November 2, 1998, OCTA Staff presented a proposal to the OCTA Board's Executive Committee to add a general-purpose lane alternative as part of the environmental review and preliminary engineering for the State Route 22/West County Connection project. In addition, Staff presented a proposal from SCAG to conduct a two-phase regional HOV system performance study. The Executive Committee recommended against these proposals based on concerns about the overall costs, timing, and other factors associated with the proposed studies. On November 9, 1998, the OCTA Board confirmed the Executive Committee's recommendation and voted to not pursue a general-purpose lane alternative in the environmental document and preliminary engineering for the project. The Board also voted to defer Phase I of SCAG's HOV system performance study until Orange County's HOV system is completed, yet decided to support Phase II of SCAG's regional study as part of their Overall Work Program.

On April 26, 1999, the OCTA Board expanded the project scope of work to include improvements at The City Drive and SR-22. The OCTA Board again took action on January 24, 2000 when a Reduced Build Alternative was added to the environmental document and preliminary engineering due to higher than anticipated environmental impacts associated with the Full Build Alternative.

10.4 ISSUES IDENTIFIED

The PIP allowed residents, business owners, and city officials the opportunity to voice concerns and identify issues regarding development of the study. Survey results from the three public workshops and the open house/public scoping meeting showed that residents were most concerned with right-of-way acquisitions and noise impacts followed by safety, air quality, and cost issues. The *SR-22/West Orange County Connection Major Investment Study Public Workshop Report* (March 1998) (Appendix A, Volume II of DEIR/EIS) outlines the results and issues identified during the public involvement program.

Responses to the NOIS, NOP, and NOI and comments received in public meetings are summarized below.

10.4.1 Responses to NOIS and NOP

A. ROBERT WARTH, TECHNICAL SUPERVISOR, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA GAS COMPANY

Requested that "signed" final plans and subsequent revisions be sent to them as soon as possible. A minimum of 12 weeks is required to analyze the plans and design alterations due to conflicting facilities. Upon request, at least two days prior to the start of construction, the Gas Company will mark underground facilities at no cost. No special permits are needed other than what the cities require.

B. GEORGE BROWN, MAYOR OF SEAL BEACH

Returned three comments on the Environmental Checklist.

- Affect on agriculture resources - page 13 section "Id." The study indicates that impacts to prime farmlands are expected to be less than significant. According to Appendix G of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Handbook, a project will have a significant impact if it would convert "prime" agricultural lands to non-agricultural use, or impair the agricultural productivity of "prime" agricultural land.
- Air Quality - page 19 section V. The City asks that the air quality analysis include a study of carbon monoxide "hotspots" at adjacent freeway on/off ramp locations. They also request that mitigation measures are developed to reduce the impacts to an insignificant level.
- Recreation - page 28 section XV. This section should reflect that the existing Towne Center (adjacent to I-405) is undergoing the application process to dedicate the Bixby Old Ranch Tennis Club to the City as a public recreation center.

C. DALE RATZLAFF, CHIEF OF PLANNING, CALTRANS DISTRICT 12 (JULY 1998)

Recommended that the OCTA Board carry forward the concept of Alternative 6C as an alternative to be evaluated in the environmental process.

D. GEORGE BRITTON, MANAGER, ENVIRONMENTAL AND PROJECT PLANNING DIVISION, ORANGE COUNTY

Had these concerns regarding the project.

- The unincorporated residential neighborhood of Rossmoor will be significantly impacted.
- The Koll Company, the developer of the Bolsa Chica area, is required as a mitigation element to widen the Bolsa Chica Street (Valley View Street) bridge at the I-405 and the SR-22. They are also required to widen the arterial highways and improve intersections in the area.
- The Draft EIR/EIS should address the trails and bikeways. Any detours should be coordinated with the County and local jurisdictions.
- The Orange County Flood Control District (OCFCD) facilities are incapable of handling the 100-year discharge at the freeway crossings.
- Permits from the County's Public Facilities and Resources Department are required for any work within the OCFCD right-of-way.
- The project will need to address the reconstruction of the debris walls, etc., upstream of the Santa Ana River and Santiago Creek, as well as any reconstruction of channel slopes.
- Improvements impacting the Santa Ana River must be approved by the Army Corps of Engineers. This is separate from the Corps' 404 permit. The County Property Permit Section of the Public Facilities and Resources Department will submit the plans to the Corps for approval on behalf of OCTA, FHWA and Caltrans.
- Required grading for the improvements would impact two closed landfills: La Veta located near the corner of La Veta Avenue and Tustin Street, and Yorba located near the corner of Chapman Avenue and Yorba Street. The DEIR/EIS should address how disturbances to these landfills will be consulted with the appropriate agencies.

E. MAYA DE ROSA, PUBLIC WORKS AGENCY, CITY OF SANTA ANA

Requested that noise measurements be taken at sensitive receptor sites for each alternative. Mitigation measures should also be added to reduce the noise impacts to acceptable day- and night-time levels. There is also the potential for archeological sites in the area.

F. GERHARDT FELGEMAKER, ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING OFFICER, CITY OF LONG BEACH

Is concerned with Alternative 3, Fixed Guideway. They believe that unavoidable impacts will occur to:

- Aesthetics
- Public service
- Cultural resources
- Noise
- Land use incompatibility
- Transportation
- Environmental justice

G. JIM SMITH, CITY ENGINEER, CITY OF GARDEN GROVE

Supported HOV lanes, but strongly opposed direct, high-speed, flyover connectors to an arterial on the former Pacific Electric right-of-way. The city was concerned with the following areas of impact:

- Potential economic loss
- Visual impacts

- Potential problems with traffic circulation
- The taking of properties near Trask Avenue

The taking of residential property would result in a loss of sales and property tax revenue. The benefits to the City of Garden Grove would not outweigh these economic losses.

H. RONALD REMPEL, REGIONAL MANAGER, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Suggested that the following information be included in the DEIR/EIS:

- A complete assessment of the flora and fauna within the project study area, emphasizing endangered, threatened, and locally unique species and sensitive habitats.
- Discuss direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts expected to adversely affect biological resources with measures to offset impacts.
- Analyze alternatives that avoid or minimize impacts to sensitive biological resources. Specific alternative locations should be analyzed in areas with lower resource sensitivity.
- A CESA permit is required when there is the potential that a project will take an endangered species or plant. Early consultation is requested because modification to the project and mitigation measures may be required in order to obtain a CESA permit.
- All wetlands and water courses, whether intermittent or perennial must be retained and provided with substantial setbacks. These setbacks must preserve the riparian and aquatic values and maintain their value to the on-site and off-site wildlife populations.

I. JIM BARTEL, ASSISTANT FIELD SUPERVISOR U.S. DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND WILDLIFE

Requests that the following information be analyzed in the DEIR/EIS:

- A complete description of the project and practical alternatives that reduce impacts to the sensitive habitats and endangered, threatened or sensitive species.
- Qualitative and quantitative assessments of the biological resources and habitat types that will be impacted by the project.
- Assess direct, indirect, and cumulative affects of all steps of the project (construction, implementation, operation, and maintenance) to fish and wildlife. Growth inducing effects of the project should also be discussed.
- The DEIR/EIS should discuss the measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands. Wetlands should be delineated using the methodology set forth in the Corps' *Wetlands Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory, 1987).¹

10.4.2 Responses to NOI

A. ROBERT LUMAN, CHIEF OF POLICE, CITY OF LONG BEACH

Commented that there were no major impacts to his jurisdiction at the time.

B. JERE MURPHY, SENIOR PROJECT PLANNER, CITY OF ORANGE

Commented on two historic properties and two other properties undergoing redevelopment. The first property undergoing construction is the Town and Country Shopping Center located on the south side of the freeway, east of Main Street. It will be rebuilt as a retail center with approximately the same square footage as the current use. The second is The City Shopping Center located on the north side of the freeway between the City Drive and Lewis Street. It has been demolished and rebuilt as an entertainment/shopping center. The first historic property in the area is Old Town Orange. It was recently added to the Federal Register and therefore has been the subject of improvement proposals. The second historic property is Hart Park, located on the east side of Glassell Street and north of the freeway. Hart Park is the oldest of the city's neighborhood parks. The portion adjacent to the freeway was developed and added to the park in the mid-

¹ Available at Caltrans, District 12.

1970s. Part of the park at the corner of Glassell Street and SR-22 was developed into an orange grove as a perpetual exhibit of the city's agricultural history.

C. GEORGE BROWN, MAYOR OF SEAL BEACH

Commented on an improvement project for the bridge widening at Seal Beach Boulevard. He is concerned about various alternatives in relation to this portion of the project area. Brown also commented on the affects of the right-of-way acquisition to the College Park East neighborhood, located north of I-405 between Seal Beach Boulevard and Valley View Street. He feels that any further encroachment into this residential area would be detrimental to the neighborhood and to the City of Seal Beach.

D. MEL LEE, ASSOCIATE PLANNER, CITY OF GARDEN GROVE

Mentioned three projects currently under consideration within the project study area. The first is the Garden Grove Auto Center Expansion, currently located on the south side of Trask Avenue, east of Brookhurst Street. The 3.2-acre expansion, currently in the planning stage, is located south of Trask Avenue, between Brookhurst Street and Taft Street. The second site is the addition of Garden Grove freeway signs at the Mobile Home Park (70 feet high), in the OCTA right-of-way (130 feet high) and at the Auto Center (70 feet high). The third site is a 3,737 square foot proposed car wash building in the OCTA right-of-way between Harbor Boulevard and Westminster Avenue. Historic structures include a Eucalyptus Vat on Trask Avenue at Taft Street, and the Robinson House at 10342 Central Avenue.

10.4.3 Public Workshops

A. PUBLIC COMMENT QUALITATIVE RESULTS

The following characterizes input received from all sources.

- There was a general consensus that there is a current congestion problem along the SR-22 that should be addressed.
- The vast majority of participants believed additional transportation improvements were necessary. This was evidenced by the fact that the “no build” alternative had little to no support.
- The most frequently voiced concern related to the lack of existing noise barriers and the manner in which they would be provided in the future.
- There were concerns about whether property would be taken if SR-22 was expanded and the impacts of any expansion to those living adjacent to the SR-22.
- Other concerns were expressed about the impact to nearby intersections, public safety and health.
- There was broad consensus that several of the current access ramps to the SR-22 are dangerous and cause congestion. Most people believed that all the ramps need to be included in the study.
- There was a broad consensus that if a rail system was built it must be supported by a feeder system.
- Some people recommended that future meetings be better publicized.

At the meetings, most people were satisfied with the range of the alternatives proposed for the study. Several people commented the “No Build” alternative was not an option considering the growth in Orange County and some individuals opposed the HOV option. Many encouraged OCTA to initially look at studying the addition of two or more lanes in each direction on the SR-22 regardless of the right-of-way concerns. The general consensus was to initially look at everything and to “think big.” Several people felt the need to transition to and from HOV lanes in order to access exits cause dangerous conditions and accidents. A few individuals argued HOV lanes were not efficient and should not be considered.

People had mixed opinions about the potential use of the former Pacific Electric right-of-way. Some suggested converting the former Pacific Electric right-of-way to an HOV-only use. A few people liked the idea of an elevated rail system along the former Pacific Electric right-of-way with open space underneath. When the issue of rail was discussed, most people agreed that residents in Orange County need an alternative to their cars, but they cautioned rail will not work if supporting bus feeder systems are not in place.

There was not much comment about the TSM/Expanded Bus Service Alternative. One person commented that, “these types of improvements don’t cost anything so why aren’t they already being implemented?”

There was some reference to the Century Freeway project at each of the meetings, and the general consensus was OCTA should not “make this another Century Freeway project.”

At each meeting there was minimal interest in the SCAG's role in the regional transportation planning process. Members of Drivers For Highway Safety, a freeway advocacy group, requested that OCTA clarify whether SCAG would require HOV lanes on SR-22 and encouraged OCTA to involve a SCAG representative in the process.

B. GARDEN GROVE/LOS ALAMITOS MEETINGS, DECEMBER 9 AND 11, 1997

Residents and the public who attended the Los Alamitos and Garden Grove public workshops had the following comments and concerns.

- Concerns about the specific impacts to their properties and immediate area and right-of-way issues.
- OCTA needs a more thorough notification process. A suggestion was made to use the city water bills.
- Concerns about the long-term failure of Caltrans to provide noise barriers to shield the residential area near Anthony Avenue. The noise barrier issue should be resolved and existing noise mitigated before any new improvements are implemented. Erecting noise barriers would help improve safety and public health in their neighborhoods. Noise barriers would help eliminate drive-by shootings in the area.
- Concerns about homeless people entering private property.
- Concerns about rats and trash on their properties.
- Concerns about property takes, adequate compensation for the current market value of their homes, and the property valuation and compensation process.

C. OCTA, ORANGE MEETING, DECEMBER 10, 1997

Residents and the public who attended the Orange Public Workshop had the following comments and concerns.

- Concerns about congestion and moving traffic throughout the entire project area.
- Comments regarding the need for all ramps and transitions to be evaluated for safety. Ramp safety should be a goal of the study.
- Issues of funding, funding sources, priorities, and how OCTA was communicating its priorities to state and federal officials.

D. SURVEY RESULTS

Workshop attendees and newspaper survey respondents were asked to list the biggest traffic problems throughout the study area on their surveys. The problem spots varied based on the respondents neighborhood and commute patterns. The participants' comments and survey results are listed below:

- Existing southbound SR-57 to the westbound SR-22 connector: There are bottlenecks because the lanes merge into one lane at Bristol Street and Memory Lane. This causes a backup to Haster Street in Garden Grove.
- The westbound SR-22 on-ramp at Haster Street is very dangerous (more dangerous than it has been in 12 years).
- The City Drive exit is unsafe. The exit needs to be moved west of the current location or a bridge needs to be built over it because it is too tight of a connection. There is a business with 800 employees located at this exit and they cannot get off the SR-22 to get to work. To help these employees, send a newsletter to the businesses and their employees regarding the status and safety issue at the City Drive ramp."
- SR-55 and Bristol Street ramp is unsafe. All the ramps along the SR-22 are unsafe. The surface streets are all congested due to the unsafe ramp problems.
- There is a 180-degree turn at the Orange Crush and the SR-57 transition, which is dangerous. The bridge is too small and dangerous – this entire area is a hazard. It needs a direct connector.

- The noise barriers were erected in the wrong areas according to residents in the Los Alamitos area. Noise barriers were erected at Beach Boulevard and Magnolia Avenue and Knott Street and Valley View Street, but not where they are needed.
- If this project goes through there will be no room for the expansion and reconfiguration of the ramps that would be necessary to handle the expansion of the bridge and access to the local roadways and freeways. There are two other proposed developments in the area that would generate additional traffic, thus impacting that ramp area.
- All connectors to and from the freeways at either end of the SR-22 are currently causing great congestion problems.

Specific problem spots listed by workshop survey respondents included:

Los Alamitos.

- Interchange between Los Alamitos Boulevard and Valley View Street
- Orange Crush at The City Drive
- I-405/SR-22 northbound transition
- SR-22/I-405 interchange (several people listed this)
- Freeway-to-freeway interchanges at the SR-22 and the I-405, I-605, and I-710 (outside study area)
- Bridge widening at Seal Beach Boulevard and the SR-22/I-405 (several similar comments)
- I-405/ I-605 transition
- Seal Beach Boulevard and Lampson Avenue
- Ramp at Seal Beach Boulevard and I-405
- SR-22 eastbound approaching the Orange Crush
- SR-22 westbound approaching the I-405
- SR-22 at Beach Boulevard
- SR-22 and SR-55 interchange (several similar comments)
- Springdale Street overpass
- SR-22 between the SR-55 and Harbor Boulevard
- Brookhurst Avenue
- SR-22/SR-57 interchange
- SR-22 between Beach Boulevard and Harbor Boulevard
- SR-22 between Magnolia Avenue and I-5

Garden Grove.

- Orange Crush (a few people listed this)
- SR-22 throughout all of Garden Grove
- SR-22 between Seal Beach Blvd. and SR-55
- SR22/SR-57 interchange
- Magnolia westbound
- Congestion on all ramps
- SR-22 east between Brookhurst and SR-55 (several similar comments)
- SR-22 west to I-405
- SR-22 westbound slowing at Harbor Boulevard

Orange.

- Freeway to freeway interchanges at I-405/I-605, SR-22/I-405, and SR-22/I-5/SR-57 (several similar comments)
- Orange Crush
- All on- and off-ramps use old technology, which causes slowing
- SR-22 at the Orange Crush
- Southbound SR-57 to SR-22 connector
- Lack of signal synchronization

Problem spots listed by newspaper survey respondents.

- Vehicle stoppages on SR-22 at the I-405, I-605, and I-710
- List speed limits in the lanes so that speeds are maintained; ensure that the left lane is used for passing only
- Ban buses, trucks, and government vehicles (except police)
- Improved on- and off-ramps along the entire SR-22
- Eliminate meters at the on-ramps along the entire SR-22
- Eastbound SR-22 at I-405 from Seal Beach Boulevard; backs up two to three lights during peak hours
- Repair the crack on the SR-22 near Neptune Court, west of Newhope Street
- Orange Crush congestion at peak hours; construction will make this problem worse
- SR-22 interchange at the SR-57 and I-5
- Off-ramp at The City Drive
- Interchanges at SR-22 eastbound and I-5 southbound
- Bristol Street exit ramp causes back ups on the entire SR-22
- SR-57 southbound to SR-22 westbound
- Interchange at SR-22 and I-405 between Valley View Street and I-405 at I-605
- Need noise barriers on the north side of the SR-22 between Knott Street and Valley View Street

10.4.4 Scoping Meeting**A. TIM MORLOY, MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC**

Said he was frustrated with the fact that soundwalls stopped just before they got to them (east of Haster Street). Only about 20 houses were “missed.” Asked if studies will be transferred over into the new SR-22 project.

B. JOHN ROCCO, MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

He has lived right behind the Valley View Street off-ramp for 11 years. He has done everything he can personally to mitigate the noise – double-paned windows, block walls – but it is still too noisy. Soundwall ends between Beach Boulevard and Knott Street, but includes an industrial area. Why did an industrial area get a soundwall? The traffic is so heavy he cannot enjoy his backyard. Trucks downshifting are a problem, especially at night. When would they take the sound readings? They need to take them at the noisiest hour. What did OCTA mean about alternative abatement? When is the next meeting? Could the preferred alternative be to have no project?

C. CORINNE BRUBAKER, MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC

She represents approximately 20 senior citizens on Anthony Street. When they bought their homes they were told a soundwall was going to be built. They have gotten the runaround for years – promises not kept. They were told that “the squeaky wheel” process worked best, but it had not. Her front yard, across the street from John Rocco’s house, is too noisy to use. She could not open her windows at night. Said attendance was low because people didn’t want to come out of frustration with the bureaucracy. Said they needed a voice in what happens. Wanted to know about property takes, so she could sell her house before the rest of the public found out. She was willing to help OCTA/Caltrans get the word out to the residents. No one got a newsletter. Is it too early to tell where property would be taken? When would they know? Will construction start at the SR-55 end. She envisions them “running out of money” for soundwalls before they get to her house again. Are there any state or federal regulations regarding impact of freeways on lungs?

D. UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF PUBLIC 1

Had a letter (from Caltrans?) stating that eastbound between Springdale Street and Knott Street had a higher priority. Why were they on the priority "list" when they were not residences? There is a tire company there.

E. UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF PUBLIC 2

Why do more noise assessment? Just use the previous Caltrans work.

F. UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF PUBLIC 3

What about safety? He got cars coming over the side right up to his backyard.

G. UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF PUBLIC 4

What about a soundwall near the car dealerships? They just cleared away all the landscaping around the dealership and now it is noisier. Did the card dealership pay Caltrans to remove the landscaping?

H. UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF PUBLIC 5

Didn't I see that one alternative would remove the car dealerships?

I. UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF PUBLIC 6

How many of the surveys (from the paper) have you received?

10.4.5 Elected Officials Meetings

The elected officials had concerns regarding:

- Right-of-way takes in their cities
- Funding for the project, specifically the use of Measure M
- Sound walls and noise mitigation
- Other possible alternatives

This page intentionally blank.